

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

RUTH PARKER,

Plaintiff,

v.

DELOITTE CONSULTING LLP,

Defendant.

CIVIL ACTION
NO. 21-2828

ORDER

AND NOW, this 30th day of January 2024, upon consideration of Defendant Deloitte Consulting LLP's Motion for Summary Judgment (Doc. No. 41), Plaintiff's Response in Opposition (Doc. No. 43), and Defendant Deloitte Consulting LLP's Reply (Doc. No. 46), and in accordance with the Opinion of the Court issued this day, it is **ORDERED** that Defendant's Motion for Summary Judgment (Doc. No. 41) is **GRANTED** in part and **DENIED** in part as follows:

1. Defendant's Motion for Summary Judgment (Doc. No. 41) is **GRANTED** as to Plaintiff's age discrimination claim under the Age Discrimination in Employment Act ("ADEA") and Pennsylvania Human Relations Act ("PHRA") in Counts One and Three of the Complaint (Doc. No. 1).
2. Defendant's Motion for Summary Judgment (Doc. No. 41) is **GRANTED** as to Plaintiff's retaliation claim under the ADEA and PHRA in Counts One and Three of the Complaint (Doc. No. 1.)

3. Defendant's Motion for Summary Judgment (Doc. No. 41) is **DENIED** as to Plaintiff's disability discrimination claims under the Americans with Disabilities Act ("ADA") and PHRA in Counts Two and Three of the Complaint (Doc. No. 1).
4. Defendant's Motion for Summary Judgment (Doc. No. 41) is **DENIED** as to Plaintiff's ADA and PHRA failure to accommodate claim in Counts Two and Three of the Complaint (Doc. No. 1).
5. Defendant's Motion for Summary Judgment (Doc. No. 41) is **DENIED** as to Plaintiff's retaliation claim under the ADA and PHRA in Counts Two and Three of the Complaint (Doc. No. 1).
6. The claims remaining in the case are: (1) Plaintiff's disability discrimination claim under the ADA and PHRA; (2) Plaintiff's failure to accommodate claim under the ADA and PHRA; and (3) Plaintiff's retaliation claim under the ADA and PHRA.

BY THE COURT:

/s/ Joel H. Slomsky

JOEL H. SLOMSKY, J.